

POLITICAL NOTES

Vol 2 No 4

Group of Revolutionary Marxists.

May 9, 1946.

IS THE UNO A NEW WORLD STATE?

In 1919, in a manifesto to the workers of the world, the 2d Congress of the Communist International declared:

"Under the 'League of Nations' flag, the United States made an attempt to extend to the other side of the ocean its experience with a federated unification of large, multi-national masses -- an attempt to chain to its chariot of gold, the peoples of Europe and other parts of the world, and bring them under Washington's rule. In essence the League of Nations was intended to be a world monopoly corporation, 'Yankee and Co.'" (Trotsky, 5 Years of the Communist International, vol. 1)

The US did not succeed all thru that postwar period in attaining a world monopoly corporation. It took a second world war to bring Yankee imperialism to a position where she could dominate a league of nations -- the UNO. But this time also she has failed to achieve an international Yankee & Co. And she -- or any other imperialist power, no matter how great or strong -- must fail each time she tries.

Imperialism is that stage of capitalism where the earth is dominated by a few robber nations which have divided the earth among themselves. Capitalist production is production for a market. The imperialist countries as well as the small capitalist nations fight for that market in peacetime and in wartime. Their treaties and deals and agreements and alliances are merely stepping stones toward the goal coveted by each power: world domination. Consequently, whatever bloc or organization they create, will be of a loose or temporary character. Certainly it will not determine policy for its backers but will conform in policy to the agreements made between the powers.

Lenin discussed this question in 1915 and came to the conclusion that unity of even European capitalism in one organization was impossible of achievement:

"...in the epoch of the highest development of capitalism, the plunder of about a billion of the earth's population by a handful of great powers is organized. No other organization is possible under capitalism. Give up colonies, 'spheres of influence,' export of capital? To think this is possible means sinking to the level of a little minister who preaches to the rich every Sunday about the greatness of Christianity and advises them to give to the poor, if not several billions, at least several hundred rubles yearly.

"A United States of Europe under capitalism is equivalent to an agreement to divide up the colonies. Under capitalism, however, no other basis, no other principle of division is possible except force... War does not contradict the principles of private property -- on the contrary, it is a direct and inevitable development of those principles..."

"Of course temporary agreements between capitalists and between the powers are possible. In this sense the United States of Europe is possible as an agreement between the European capitalists - - -but what for? Only for the purpose of jointly suppressing socialism in Europe, of jointly protecting colonial booty against Japan and America, which feel badly treated by the present division of colonies...

"The United States of the World (not of Europe alone) is a state form of national federation and national freedom which we connect with socialism - until the complete victory of communism brings about the total disappearance of the state." (The United States of Europe Slogan, S W vol V, pp 139-141)

Here is contained the answer to all the hogwash written about San Francisco, the UNO, world peace, stopping aggression, etc., etc! The UNO is nothing more nor less than a league of nations under the domination of US imperialism. It represents the second attempt by a big power to organize the world for imperialist exploitation. Under cover of an elaborate structure and vague verbiage, it is another thieves' kitchen which will brew and stew and scheme and horse trade and decide nothing fundamental with regard to anything.

The recent to-do over Iran and the Soviet Union revealed its true character. After all the solemn conclaves and parliamentary pronouncements, the whole business involving 2 "member-nations" was settled out of court! The UNO merely provided a talk shop, a pressure valve. The vital issues were privately dealt with by the 2 countries immediately concerned, while US and Britain exerted pressure in their own interests both inside and outside the UNO framework. And so it will go with every other issue.

This is repeating the experience of the first League of Nations. When Italy made a grab for Ethiopia the liberals and reformists were busy appealing to the authority of that thieves' kitchen. They wanted the League to apply sanctions. But there was no unified policy pursued by the member nations. Each did as her own national capitalist policy dictated. Even when the League finally did vote sanctions, Italy continued to do as she pleased and so, too, did the other nations. Agreements or authority of the League centered primarily around tariff, trade pacts, etc.

The liberals and social reformists are therefore perpetrating a criminal betrayal when they hold this up as the hope of the world, the way to peace and freedom. They are covering up the brutal exploitation and plunder which underlies this UNO. They are once again leading the working class to support of imperialist war.

To fight imperialism one must recognize its true predatory character. You cannot reconcile the bombing of Japanese workers and peasants with support of the UNO on which sit Britain and the Netherlands. You cannot support the Greek proletariat and at the same time recognize the "democracy" of a Greek bourgeois puppet sitting in the UNO. Either one supports the working class or one supports the bourgeoisie. The UNO is no middle road. The Stalinists dissolved the 3d

PN-----3
International and embraced this imperialist thieves kitchen. The Socialist will continue to deplore the direction in which it is "tending." They have made sufficiently clear which side they support.

But one can also capitulate to it while cursing it out. Therein lies the crime of those who raise it to the level of some imperialist Juggernaut, some world super-state. As the revolutionary wave in the Far East advances, the UNO will emerge more openly as a counter-revolutionary center. It may even be the form under which imperialist intervention against the Soviet Union takes place. But the menace to the working class will come from the armed forces of the imperialist member-nations and not from the UNO per se. The main enemy of the working class will still be its "own" imperialist oppressors and not the UNO. Except as there is joint agreement among the powers UNO cannot move with any effectiveness. It would be criminal to tell the proletariat of Java that the main counter-revolutionary force is not at London and Amsterdam but in the Bronx! It would be criminal to tell the British and Dutch workers that the way to aid the Javanese revolution is by weakening the economy and armed forces of the UNO!

When so-called revolutionary outfits echo the bourgeois propaganda about a world police force, they are calling into question the nature of capitalism and imperialism, and disorienting the working class struggle. The RWL for example speaks of this "international police force" as something which the US will create because it "is determined to have the means legally for crushing any and all revolutions." (International News 4/46) What the devil are they talking about? US NEWS says quite openly (Blueprint for UNO Police, 4/5/46):

"A world police force very different from that popularly expected is now approaching the blueprint stage. What is to emerge from the blueprints, months hence, is to be a world police force that will neither police the world nor have overwhelming force.

"Popular notions of an all-powerful, strongly unified world police force...are not in the minds of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations Organization now meeting in New York...

"Instead, what is to develop out of the UNO's Military Staff Committee is a series of commitments, nation by nation, to earmark certain forces for the use of UNO on a when, as and if basis..All national forces earmarked are to remain integral parts of each nation's armed force, until called upon for duty by UNO. But none may be called up by UNO without unanimous agreement of the Big Five.

"There is to be no merged, unified world force constantly patrolling the trouble spots of the world for UNO,"

"The fact that each of the Big Five can veto use of the world police force means that the force will not be used against the territory or interests of the vetoing nation..."

"This veto on the use of UNO's police force is not limited, however, to the Big Five..."

"The only place where UNO could send its police force..., there--fore, is a nation or area in which the Big Five has no interest. Whether such an area exists is dubious.

"US policy toward UNO's world police force is to cooperate fully in establishing it, but not to expect much from it...If force becomes necessary, the US will have to rely upon its own military strength."

True internationalism, true world unity will be achieved only by the working class. The UNO is no substitute for international working class solidarity. It is no substitute for the building of the world revolutionary party - a new international. The task of world proletarian revolution still faces us if we wish to abolish capitalism and imperialism.

4/7/46

~~~~~

### T H E P A Y O F F

The stockholders of Montgomery Ward, at their annual meeting on April 26th, heard the happy ending to the story of government "seizure:"

"Seizure of Montgomery Ward by the army had no 'substantial' adverse effect on either sales or profits, said John A. Barr, assistant secretary. The army paid out of government funds to operate the company over 1 million dollars more than it took in and Ward voluntarily has paid the government all but \$325,000 of that amount, said Barr.

"The management believes that this \$325,000 is more than sufficient to offset all the extra expense and damage resulting from the seizure," he said." (Chicago TRIBUNE, April 27, 1946, p. 17)

So at last the full story is out. For attempting to smash its workers' union, for defying the WLB orders and resisting government seizure, the government punishes Montgomery Ward by giving it (a) the temporary use of over 1 million dollars as operating capital and (b) an outright subsidy of \$325,000.

Here is the phony "impartiality" of "our" government. Here is the low-down on the government's "getting tough" with Montgomery Ward. That company could well adopt as its slogan, "Seizure me Uncle! I love it."

### NOTE ON THE FOLLOWING ARTICLE

The article on the following pages is based on a speech delivered to about two hundred workers in a forum discussion of Russia. It was delivered at the time the Red Army was advancing on Berlin and its main purpose was to drive home the difference between a purely military Russian victory and a victory for the October Revolution. We present it, with some elaborations and additions, at this time in an attempt to make clearer and more specific the question of the class struggle as it exists in the Soviet Union.



## THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN THE U.S.S.R.

1. The Soviet Union is the product of the class struggle between workers and capitalists which reached its most open and decisive expression in 1917: Revolution. It was established by the working class which, armed with a revolutionary program and leadership, ousted the bourgeoisie from power and set up a dictatorship over it. The Bolshevik program was based on a recognition and analysis of the class struggle. In the imperialist war of 1914-18 they hewed to this line, placing the workers' interests higher than the capitalists' war. They were not content with the so-called democracy of the Entente powers. They were for proletarian dictatorship. Their program was clearly demarcated from that of the Mensheviks', rival working class organization. The Mensheviks were pro-war, pro-capitalist democracy, against proletarian rule. Had their program been followed there would have been no revolution and no Soviet Union.

The Bolshevik program was internationalist. In fact, it called for the creation of a new international. They did not regard Russia as merely an oppressed country with a bad tsar -- they worked for world social revolution. The Russian Revolution was the first in a revolutionary wave that shook Europe to its foundations and forced the warring imperialist nations to declare peace. It is the symbol of the one positive answer to exploitation and war. It is the answer to all reformists and anti-politicos. The workers seized power in revolutionary struggle, held it and wielded it. Millions of others all over the world -- from India to the US -- saw its significance and broke from their pro-war, pro-capitalist leaders.

2. Proletarian victory in the Soviet Union did not end the class struggle there. The class struggle will continue to exist as long as a remnant of capitalist economy does. Victory, however, gave the proletariat the upper hand. Its class interest was expressed thru the workers state, the organization of economy, the steps taken to eliminate capitalist economy.

Thus the economy in Russia under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat was represented by 2 sections hostile to each other: On the one hand, were the banks, basic industry and trusts and the transport industry which were nationalized by the workers state -- a sector of economy within which the profit motive had been abolished. On the other hand, were the host of peasants, small traders, artisans and petty commodity producers who made up a sector of the economy still motivated by profit, still impelled toward exploitation of labor and growth into actual capitalists.

Flowing out of the heritage from capitalism there were a 1-1 sorts of bourgeois hangovers in the form of living habits, thought patterns and, more materially, individuals and strata such as officers and civil servants who were not too well off economically but thru their associations and activities were capitalist in outlook.

The proletariat was faced with the task of strengthening the socialist segment of the economy and combatting the capitalist por-

tion and the capitalist ideologies. This could be done only by organizing those spheres, dominated by the capitalists, on a socialist basis, by training and educating ever more workers to administer the new economy. "Every cook a statesman" was Lenin's slogan. To do this, to prevent the petty bourgeois careerists, the already trained civil servants of the bourgeoisie, from usurping these functions and twisting their positions to advance the interests of the capitalist elements in the country, required constant struggle and vigilance by the proletariat. It necessitated strong proletarian organizations such as trade unions, factory committees, workers and peasants soviets. It involved knowing how to split the ranks of the non-proletarian elements such as the peasantry.

Thus in the countryside, one must know how to deal with the poor and middle peasants so that they will fight the big farmers who try to oppress even them. At the same time, it involves guarding against even the small farmers dominating the proletariat. This class split in the countryside was accomplished thru unions of agricultural workers, committees of poor peasants, greater representation in the rural soviets to agricultural workers and poor peasants.

In the city, it means that workers must get a larger share of the surplus value they produce turned back to them in the form of services such as housing, recreation centers, etc. Distribution of goods should be increased with workers given preference. Care must be taken to see that they're not mulcted by the middle men, petty traders, etc.

This is a continuous struggle -- not necessarily by force of arms -- which cannot stop even though the revolution has been successfully made and the workers have come to power. If the proletariat ceases its alertness, ceases to struggle against the elements and remnants of capitalism, these same elements will push forward and try once again to exploit and defeat the working class.

4. This is exactly what has been occurring in the Soviet Union. The workers seized power; they forcibly overthrew and smashed the capitalist state; they set up a workers state based on soviets or councils. Under the revolutionary leadership of the Bolshevik Party they forged ahead. They licked the physical, outside capitalist intervention on 18 fronts. They dealt with the problem of getting the factories running again, the production of food in the countryside after the devastation wrought by civil war and intervention. This was a tremendous job in so backward a country. In Germany or the US had there been a successful revolution, it would have been far easier because of their greater industrialization, higher productivity, and smaller percentage of small farmers and tradesmen.

In the course of this tremendous job the party succumbed. Under the pressure of adverse conditions -- an unfavorable international situation, poverty and disorganization, the illiteracy and backwardness of a large section of the population -- opportunist tendencies seeking to gain relief by compromising with capitalism, by watering down the party program, cropped up within the party. Stalin headed just such a tendency and after a long, involved and bitter struggle succeeded

PM-----7  
in seizing control of the party. Essentially this intra-party struggle was a reflection of the class struggle in the country between workers and well-to-do peasantry, small traders, etc.

Stalin's victory in collaboration with these non-working class forces represented the weakening of the proletariat's resistance to capitalism. A policy of class peace was gradually substituted for one of class struggle. A compromise was effected with the peasants, especially the large ones. They were given a larger share of the national income, told to enrich themselves. The bureaucracy in the Communist Party and in the government apparatus resisted the pressure of the working class forces which were putting forth a program of industrialization with the end of using the productive powers of the economy to better the living standards of the masses. There was a dearth of consumer goods as a result of the class collaboration line of the bureaucracy which inflicted suffering on both workers and farmers.

To carry out this line the leadership was forced to cut down more and more on working class control and expression. The role of the soviets was reduced to a mere shadow, the trade unions decreased in influence, shop committees and other working class organs were emasculated. One of the forms this process assumed was the idea that the leadership was not to be questioned, the party could do no wrong, etc. The Stalinists, kulaks, nepmen all in one way or another benefitted from the enormous prestige enjoyed by the Communist Party as leader of the revolution -- they used this party now to put thru an anti-working class policy.

Naturally the Stalinist line of class collaboration did not end the class struggle. It did mean that the class struggle was waged with the worker being put more and more at a disadvantage. The same process occurred here when the trade union bureaucracy pledged to the capitalist government that there would be no strikes in wartime. The class struggle continued but the workers were put in a weaker position by the class collaboration policy of their leaders.

The program of class peace was not limited to the territory of the Soviet Union. It was expressed also in the foreign policy of trying to reconcile the dictatorship of the proletariat with the world capitalist system. It was expressed in the policy of the Stalinist parties all over the world. The offensive against capitalism launched by the 3rd International, the call for revolution in the tradition of the Russian proletariat, was abandoned in favor of a bogus "defense of the Soviet Union": a strategy of capitalist power politics instead of a strategy for revolution, "we in Russia will survive and the devil with the international working class."

Again this bears a striking resemblance to the policy of Murray or Green whose strategy is based on maintaining the privileged position which they have won and an utter disregard for the problems of other workers -- often in the same trade or industry.

They trumpeted non-aggression pacts -- as tho any capitalist nation could be non-aggressive. They rendered political support to the Peoples Front in Spain and gave no support at all to the revolutionary working class forces.



6. These policies enabled the capitalist elements to grow until they won a recognized position in the bureaucracy. They pushed forward until they felt strong enough to wrest a good portion of the apparatus out of the hands of the Stalinist clique which in turn had usurped it from the proletariat.

The 1937 trials and the Stalin constitution were highlights in this process. Even tho Soviets were officially liquidated in 1936 by the adoption of this new constitution, the open reign of terror against the working class did not begin until after it was promulgated. There are two reasons for this: 1) The Stalinist party in the process of yielding to the bourgeois pressure had gone as far as it could -- it was losing ground in the whole relationship to the capitalist elements. It no longer proved useful to people who were impatient of working thru social reformism, who wanted a place in the sun.

2) The working class of the Soviet Union was resentful of these changes, the Spanish revolution was causing considerable dissatisfaction with the policy of the bureaucracy which refused to tender aid to the Spanish revolution. This dissatisfaction expressed itself finally in demonstrations in Moscow for aid to the Spanish Revolution -- the Soviet proletariat remained true to its revolutionary heritage. They forced aid to Spain -- which, of course was misdirected by the bureaucracy into bourgeois channels.

The capitalist elements retaliated by striking back at the workers, directly or indirectly terrorizing them. In the course of this, the extreme right wing of the bureaucracy tried to sweep the Stalinists completely out of power. The 1937 purges resulted in a profound change in the social composition of the CPSU. Previous to 1937, the CP had consciously attempted to recruit primarily from the workers and poor peasants and to maintain them as the dominant numerical element in the party. After the 1937 purges -- which were primarily a terror campaign against the working class -- such ideas were dropped and the dominant party element became state officials, managers, engineers, technicians, army officers, etc. When the tumult and the shooting died, the apparatus was manned by a whole new set of bureaucrats who assumed a more and more dominant position in relation to the Stalinists left in the apparatus.

7. Only now was the new constitution able to be fully applied. Only now was its significance revealed. Under the old constitution the working class tho a minority of the population had the hegemony -- that is, the city soviets had representation on the basis of 1 for every 25,000 while the country or rural soviets were on the basis of 1 for every 125,000. The new constitution took representation off its open class basis -- it provided a flat 1 for every 300,000. Not only did this cut down on the number of representatives, much more important, it put the urban proletariat in a parliamentary minority as against the rural peasantry. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat was struck a severe blow.

The land -- a monopoly of the workers state, something the proletariat in alliance with the peasantry had made a revolution in order to nationalize and to socialize -- was in part given back to the peasantry and the better off ones at that. The collectives were allowed title and ownership to the land they worked and lived on forever. The peasants within the collectives were further allotted in-



dividual plots to own and farm and sell their produce individually.

The encouragement and growth of bourgeois practices and the resultant disadvantageous position of the proletariat was reflected also in the educational decrees promulgated in 1940. Education, instead of becoming increasingly available to the lowest strata of the working class, was reinforced as a prop to the more privileged sections of society. The last 3 years of secondary school were no longer free. All universities, colleges and technical schools likewise charged for tuition. The fees ranged from 50 to 500 rubles per month; compared with the average wage of 150-200 rubles a month, it will be seen how far out of reach higher education has become.

The capitalist force was not content with the shackling of science, taking it out of the reach of the working class, trying to take powerful weapons out of their hands. They achieved an open sanction of superstition and backwardness thru the legalization of the church. This master class organization had for centuries helped to keep the poor and ignorant in subjection, has fought the advance of science and social development. In Russia it was a center for the counter-revolution and consistently opposed the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was outlawed and the priestly caste disfranchised in the early days. It had a strong hold on the peasantry. Its recognition today can only mean a desire on the part of the ruling bureaucracy to make peace with the enemies of the revolution, to wash away its gains, to substitute ikons for tractors in the countryside.

All these actions point to the fact that under the forms of the new, the old is advancing. The class struggle takes place with the capitalist elements on the offensive and the proletariat and its institutions in retreat.

8. But what of the 5-year plans, industrialization the comparatively better position of national minorities, the heroic defense of the Soviet Union against German imperialist intervention? All these positive phenomena do exist or have occurred. But each has been distorted in execution. Each has been twisted so that the proletariat is robbed of the full fruits. The full possibilities have not been realized.

Take for example the 5-year plans. How slow the bureaucracy was even to institute them! What a mess they found themselves in because they were afraid to wage the class struggle against the peasantry boldly! What unnecessary sacrifices were imposed on the proletariat in order to achieve them! It is not enough to point to factories and say this was achieved under Stalin, therefore Stalin or those to the right of him are good. It is necessary to understand that no matter how progressive a development may appear, there is no guarantee that within it or alongside of it there are no modifying or destructive factors. One cannot lose oneself in building factories and ignore the liquidation of soviets, restoration of the church, etc. The same forces that are responsible for the latter will arrest the development of the former and disrupt the whole economy.

This is what the reformists and centrists fail to see. They will criticize the surface phenomena and accept the economic phenomena at face value. They will defend the Soviet Union without fighting the bureaucracy. They will criticize and condemn the Soviet Union for



10-----PN  
terror against the workers. But nowhere will they show positively how to defend it or how to end the terror. They have accepted the premise that the bureaucracy is all right in certain fields, but they fail to show that the advances made by the Soviet Union are shot thru with contradictions, that the weaknesses and distortions are to be found not only in the GPU but in the 5-year plans and in the advance of the Red Army. And they will be totally unprepared for the counter-revolution when it openly emerges.

The whole question of the conduct of the war is very germane. Despite all the military show and the arrival of the Red Army in Berlin, the bureaucracy conducted no real defense of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Their policy did not extend the social relationships established by October; it did not strengthen the economic institutions. On the contrary, they aided world capitalism by using the Red Army as a prop against revolution in every territory into which it was sent.

First they made an agreement with German imperialism during which they supported it ideologically and even physically by holding back the revolution in those territories they occupied simultaneously with Germany. Then when Germany broke the 1939 pact and attacked the USSR, the bureaucracy turned around and made identical agreements with US and British imperialism. And the revolution in Greece, Italy, Rumania, China was stymied and held back with their aid. From ideological support to German imperialism they switched overnight to ideological support of British and Yankee imperialism. From blocking with the bourgeois isolationists in the US, for example, the Stalinist party moved to blocking with the bourgeois interventionists. The war for markets and profits suddenly became a holy war, a "people's war!"

The bureaucracy today boasts of its preparedness and the manner in which they stood off the German attack. In reality, they did nothing of the sort. Their sole role consisted in making it easier for imperialism to intervene. Our "practical men" who for years had followed a policy of trying to play off the imperialist nations against each other, who banked on imperialist peace to ensure the safety of the Soviet Union, were caught completely by surprise by the German attack. For years they had told the Russian proletariat that the main job was in the Soviet Union, to forget the workers' struggles elsewhere in the world. They remained true to their nationalist policy. What should have been the signal for an appeal to the working class of the world to defend the Soviet Union served only to tie the bureaucracy more tightly to the coat-tails of imperialism. The bureaucrats greeted the German attack with dead silence. When they rallied their bourgeois vision was clearly revealed -- they scurried to Washington and to Downing St. The tremendous influence of the Soviet Union on the world working class was used only to tie the latter also to the coat-tails of the bourgeoisie.

Within the army, the same struggle which had convulsed the country in 1937 -- bureaucracy vs. the masses and the bourgeois elements within the bureaucracy vs. the Stalinists -- had resulted in abolishing all class considerations in recruiting and in constructing the officers corps. The privilege of bearing arms was given in the 1936 constitution to "all citizens" whereas previously it had been limited to workers and poor peasants. The officers corps was also thrown open



to all regardless of class background and thru raised educational requirements for entrance, the sons of the well-to-do were favored over the workers and poor peasants. Rank was restored with higher pay, saluting, and other aspects of bourgeois discipline. The soldiers Soviets had been liquidated, and consequently no direct rank and file control existed. When war broke out, the mass of the workers were denied arms to fight against the Nazis and when the masses forced the distribution of arms, as in Moscow, this workers' militia was thrown under the wheels of the Nazi juggernaut without the support of the Red Army proper. The whole military policy was of a bourgeois character, excluding the mass of the people and depending on the troops under the control of the bourgeoisified officers corps.

This policy enabled German imperialism to drive deep into Russia. Germany was stopped not by a revolutionary German proletariat but by the dead bodies of millions of Russian workers and peasants. The Allied imperialists approved of this policy wholeheartedly. The Soviet Union was physically weakened while it acted as a stopgap against Germany, and at the same time German capitalism and capitalism all over Europe was allowed to continue unchallenged by the "leaders" of Russia's defense.

This policy reveals more sharply than all else the bankruptcy of the leadership, its complete alienation from the program and policies of the October Revolution and the Bolshevik Party. The Soviet Union grew up as an answer to World War I. Its present leadership could not apply the same lesson to World War II and say to the world proletariat: "We fight for Socialism and a workers' government all over the world". In short, when the crucial test came, they had no class answer to the bourgeoisie. They desecrated the whole achievement of the October Revolution by identifying it in the eyes of the world with the imperialists, just as they desecrate it today by sitting in the UNO, by making power politics deals with the bourgeoisie of China, Iran, etc.

9. The bureaucracy moved even further to the right in the course of the war. Using the sentiments and desires of the proletariat to defend their social conquests against imperialist intervention, they subordinated all to "military necessity". And in typical opportunist fashion justified any instrumentality which would help in the physical struggle regardless of its economic, political or social implications and long term effects. Thus the resurrection of old nationalist tradition and ideology -- appeals to carry on in the spirit of the reactionary czarist struggle against Napoleon; establishment of military orders in honor of reactionary czarist generals, etc. The growth of this tendency represented not only opportunist catch-as-catch-can policy in regard to defense, but the conscious promulgation of a Great Russian nationalist policy on the part of the more open bourgeois elements. The military ruling caste in the army grew in power and prestige during this period as a result.

The army unfortunately was not the sole scene of growth of the bourgeois elements. The CI was dissolved in this period, indication that the Stalinists were being pushed still further out of the apparatus. The Church has become more prominent. A definite tendency toward Pan-slavism is obvious. At this writing it is not possible to estimate the further economic inroads made by the bourgeois elements.



The greatest betrayal of the leadership is yet to come -- in the form of laying the Soviet Union open to still another imperialist military intervention. They are now preaching a line of class collaboration with the imperialist forces who are dying to conquer and exploit the one-sixth of the earth's surface occupied by the proletarian dictators hip. In the face of these enemies, they are disarming the Russian proletariat and the proletariat all over the world. It is important to note that in Iran, Manchuria, and Eastern Europe, the Red Army does not aid social revolution but rather acts to hold it back. The real movement comes from the native workers and peasants. (Sooner or later this can be expected to produce a break on the part of the rank-and-file with the Russian bureaucracy and the Red Army will tend to split into its component parts -- workers and peasants vs. bourgeois elements in the leadership). No matter how acrimonious Gromyko may sound in the UNO, it is still on the bourgeoisie's basis of collaboration with them. Even German capitalism, while physically weakened by the Red Army, has been propped up by the failure of the Red Army to make common cause with the exploited and oppressed of Germany.

For 20 years now the elements pressing forward in the bureaucracy have demonstrated that they bear no progressive relationship to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Nowhere in the world have they succeeded or even attempted to extend it. Whatever opportunities presented themselves, they have ignored or muffed or sold out. At most they can fight over a piece of territory and try to grab off more.

A striking proof of this bankruptcy was Stalin's recent election speech. Production, strength, winning the war, chest slapping -- such was the tenor of his "report". But social revolution, the proletariat's special relation to the means of production, the new mode of production in the SU, all these were disdainfully dismissed with a phrase. He sounds like the fat boys who boast of their union treasuries and don't give a hoot for the positive gains of the union in the sphere of workers relations with the employers. It is no accident that the material results alone and not the basis of those results -- the expropriation of the expropriators -- were stressed by Stalin. He revealed for all the world to see just where the bureaucracy stands on the fundamental achievement of the Russian Revolution.

10. The revolutionary working class does not defend territory or factories alone. It defends socialist institutions and relations. Here is the clash of interests between the capitalist elements and the masses. A progressive outcome in this clash can only come thru the building of a revolutionary Marxist party in Russia and in all other countries. The role of these parties would be: in Russia, to lead the fight of the toiling masses against the capitalist elements within the country and to defend the proletarian dictatorship with a revolutionary policy; in capitalist countries, to turn the revolutionary situations produced by the imperialist war into successful social revolutions. Successful revolution means a dictatorship of the proletariat elsewhere in the world, an extension of the social system of the USSR. This will aid the Russian proletariat to fight more firmly and successfully against the capitalist elements and capitalist sector in Russia and it will strengthen the weight of the working class forces in the fight against world imperialism.